

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

Cost Savings and Efficiency Work Group

January 7, 2003

4:00 p.m., Room 113, County-City Building

MEMBERS: Present - Russ Bayer, Jennifer Brinkman, Mark Brohman, Carol Brown, Jon Carlson, Brian Carstens, Duane Eitel, Mark Hunzeker, Rick Krueger, Greg MacLean, Melinda Pearson, Roger Reynolds, Greg Wood, Patte Newman, Allan Abbot (non-voting)
Absent - Duane Hartman, Jerry Schleich

OTHERS: Kent Morgan, Karen Jensen, Roger Figard, Nick McElvain, Randy Hoskins, Steve Masters

AGENDA ITEMS DISCUSSION:

1. Welcome - Russ Bayer, Work Group and Committee Tri-Chair

Russ Bayer brought the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. and asked if there were any changes to the agenda. None were suggested.

2. Meeting Summary Notes - October 29, 2002

Russ Bayer asked if there were any changes to the "Meeting Summary Notes" for the Work Group's December 18, 2002 meeting. No changes were noted by the Work Group members.

3. Public Comment Period

Mr. Bayer asked if there were members of the public present who would like to address the Work Group at this time. There were none.

4. Review of Upcoming Meetings and Events

Kent Morgan distributed a list of upcoming meetings and reviewed the list with the Work Group. The following meetings were confirmed: January 14, 2003, Work Group Workshop, 4:00 p.m.-6:00 p.m. at the Highlands Golf Course Clubhouse; January 15, 2003, Work Group Workshop, 4:00 p.m.-8:30 p.m. at Highlands Golf Course Clubhouse (dinner will be provided); January 21, 2003, Regular meeting, 4:00 p.m.-5:30 p.m.; January 23, 2003, tentative; January 28, 2003, Regular meeting, 4:00 p.m.-5:30 p.m.; January 30, 2003, Open House, 6:00 p.m.-8:00 p.m. in Walt Library.

5. Defining “Efficiency” and Evaluation Criteria

Karen Jensen proceeded by stating that she wanted the group to define efficiency in terms of Lincoln’s infrastructure. She also stated that she wants the group to collaboratively write a preamble to the recommendations. Ms. Jensen distributed a worksheet and asked each of the members to complete the following phrase, “My First, “Top of the Head” Definition of Efficiency for Lincoln’s Infrastructure Systems is . . .”

Ms. Jensen then stated that she wanted to see how other communities have defined efficiency and subsequently did a web search to obtain definitions. She then asked the members to read the second part of the worksheet which contained definitions of efficiency, and asked the members to edit their definition, if they so desired.

In the interest of time, Ms. Jensen stated that she will summarize the definitions and e-mail them to the work group members.

6. Review of Work Group “Ideas Exercise”

Kent Morgan distributed copies of the tabulations of the cost savings efficiency matrix which each of the members were to complete. He described the method used to compile the results. The first table showed the total of the values for each of the categories, the second sheet showed the rankings in order of a weighted total, in which each value of “1” was given a weight of 1, each value of “2” was given a weight of 5, and each “3” value was given a weight of 10; the third sheet was ranked according to the most number of “3” values.

Mr. Bayer asked if all the members agreed with the process used to rank these categories and stated that we may be able to limit future discussions to the top rankings. Melinda Pearson commented that we may want to add certain categories to the discussion list which are not necessarily based on the rankings. Rick Krueger expressed that he didn’t want to see certain categories eliminated because of the ranking system used. Carol Brown stated that she feels that a ranking of 70 or above in the weighed totals should be included in the discussion topics. Mr. Bayer stated that he agrees with her and also stated that any issue which received a total of 5 or more “3” values should be included in the discussion as well. Ms. Pearson stated that according to this procedure, we would be eliminating a lot of the issues, particularly regarding the infrastructure, that she feels are important.

Ms. Jensen stated that this group could continue to meet in the future, and certain issues would not be eliminated. She also pointed out that we may want to look at city and federal mandates which may eliminate some of the issues.

Mr. Bayer stated that our goal is to get the final recommendations to the Mayor’s Infrastructure Finance Committee (MIFC) by March.

7. Planning Next Week's Work Group Retreat

Ms. Jensen then distributed a proposed agenda for the upcoming workshop on January 14th and 15th and a list of proposed group guidelines.

Ms. Jensen stated that one of guidelines to be used during the workshop is that “everyone has something to give and something to learn.” She stated that the private sector and the public sector should respect the expertise and viewpoints of each other. That is the reason for this committee and why we have the make-up of the committee as it is.

Ms. Jensen also briefly covered the group ground rules and discussed the issue of confidentiality. She stated that she would like to see the minutes of the workshop show non-attributed comments. She feels this is necessary to create group cohesion.

Mr. Carlson asked if confidentiality should be an issue because he understood that the meetings were bound under the public meeting laws. Mr. Morgan stated that we are bound by certain laws as the group is a committee appointed by the mayor. Greg MacLean stated that if he has a question concerning an issue discussed during a meeting, he can look at the minutes and see who made the comment and get clarification from that person.

Mark Brohman expressed that he agrees with what Mr. MacLean said regarding getting clarification about a certain comment. But on the other hand, he said that he can understand the rationale behind having non-attributed comments.

Ms. Jensen then addressed the issue of a work group member being absent during a meeting. Mr. Bayer suggested that the “absent and abide” rule is the best procedure to follow. If a member knows they are going to be absent from a meeting, they can communicate their thoughts or ideas regarding an agenda item to the chairperson or Mr. Morgan in advance. All members agreed with this practice.

Mr. Brohman posed the question, if the goal is to save time and/or money, then are we going to eliminate certain issues from our discussion. Ms. Jensen stated that we should have full consensus or super majority to bring a recommendation to the MIFC. Mr. Bayer stated that, by doing this, we are not including the minority issues then.

The group agreed that they would take items to the MIFC if 75 percent or more of those committee member's present agreed to that recommendation being brought to the IFC. The group also agreed that a list would be crafted containing the remainder of the items that were not in the top rankings.

8. Other Business

There were no “Other Business” issues raised by the Work Group.

9. Adjournment

Mr. Bayer adjourned the meeting at 5:18.

I:\MIFC\cost savings work group\Mtg_Sum_Notes_Efficiency_WG_Jan_7_2003.wpd